



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,913	03/26/2004	Mauro Adami	035170-9002-02	9409
23409 7590 09/28/2007 MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP 100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE Suite 3300 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202			EXAMINER CHOI, STEPHEN	
			ART UNIT 3724	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,913

Applicant(s)

ADAMI, MAURO

Examiner

Stephen Choi

Art Unit

3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 38-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 41 and 42 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 38-40 and 43-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/9/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on August 09, 2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 51-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 51 and 56, it is not clear what structure is set forth by "at least one blade being operable to...generate a continuous slice in the web...". It appears that there is no continuous slice being generated wherein the slice being substantially transverse to a direction of movement of the web.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 3724

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 51-52, 54-57, and 65-66, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wadey US 3,059,842).

Wadey discloses all the recited elements of the invention including a cutting assembly including a cutting cylinder having a length (e.g., 10) including a plurality of independently actuated blades (e.g., 16) wherein at least one blade operable to sever and at least one blade remaining retracted during a full rotation of the cutting assembly (e.g., the element 16 is independently actuated and at least one blade is capable of being retracted during a full rotation while at least one blade is operable to sever the workpiece). Regarding claims 51 and 57, an opposing member (e.g., 14). Regarding claims 52 and 56, a plurality of actuators housed in an axis cavity (e.g., Figure 5).

6. Claims 38-39, 45-51, 53-58, and 62-66, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hallberg et al. (US 4,742,741).

Hallberg discloses all the recited elements of the invention including a cutting assembly having a length (e.g., 24) including a plurality of independently actuated blades (e.g., 268) wherein at least one blade operable to sever and at least one blade remaining retracted during a full rotation of the cutting assembly (e.g., the blades are independently and selectively actuated). Regarding claims 39, 51, and 57, an opposing member (e.g., 28). Regarding claims 45, 53, and 62, a pivoting part (e.g., 300). Regarding claims 46, 48, and 63, e.g., see Figures 1-2. Regarding claims 47 and 64, a stop (e.g., 308). Regarding claim 56, a plurality of actuators (e.g., 304, 334). Regarding claim 58, a first fulcrum (e.g., Figure 2) and a second fulcrum (e.g., at 110).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 38-40 and 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wadey.

Wadey discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the blade being operable to generate a continuous slit in the web wherein the slit being substantially transverse to a moving direction of the web. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a blade that is capable of generating a continuous slit in a web wherein the slit being substantially transverse to a moving direction of the web on the device of Wadey since the examiner takes Official Notice on the use of transverse slit as old and well known in the art of data processing systems for the purpose of recording data on a record medium. Biegel and Edburg show examples. Regarding claims 39, 51, and 57, an opposing member (e.g., 14). Regarding claims 40, 52, and 56, a plurality of actuators housed in an axis cavity (e.g., Figure 5).

9. Claims 43-44 and 60-61, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wadey.

Wadey discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for rotary distributors and solenoid valves. Instead, Wadey teaches a selective control device

Art Unit: 3724

with a pneumatic card sensing device connected with a plurality of control signal input ducts. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ rotary distributors and solenoid valves on the device of Wadey since the examiner takes Official Notice on the use of rotary distributors and solenoid valves as old and well known in the for the purpose of controlling flow of fluid. Helmstadter shows an example of such rotary distributors and solenoid valves. Furthermore, Wehmeyer, Frajdenrajch, Schechter, and Hormell show examples of the use of rotary distributor with solenoid valves.

10. Claim 59, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hallberg.

Hallberg discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for ball joints. However it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ ball joints on the device of Hallberg since the examiner takes Official Notice on the use of ball joints as old and well known in the art for the purpose pivotally joining two parts. Pabodie and Jacquier show examples of a ball joint.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 41-42 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 3724

13. Applicant's arguments filed August 9, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Wadey does not generate a continuous slice as set forth in claims 51 and 56. Applicant further contends that Hallberg does not disclose a plurality of independently actuated blades positioned along the axial length of the cutting assembly.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. As best understood, Wadey does disclose a continuous slice (e.g., 34) wherein the slice being substantially transverse to the direction of movement of the web. Moreover, Hallberg discloses a plurality of independently actuated blades and each blade is positioned along the axial length of the cutting assembly to generate a continuous slit/slice as claimed. Regarding claims 43-44 and 60-61, additional prior art references are being provided with this office action to further support the examiner's assertion of official notice (see above).

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Edburg, Biegel, Wehmeyer, Frajdenrajch, Schechter, and Hormell.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Choi whose telephone number is 571-272-4504. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-5:30.

Art Unit: 3724

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen Choi/
Primary Examiner, AU 3724
21 September 2007